REMARKS

Claims 77, 78, 80-87 and 89-94 are currently pending in the application, claims 1-76 having previously been canceled, and claims 79 and 88 being canceled by the present amendment without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 77 and 86 are the only independent claims. No new matter has been added as the foregoing amendments have support in the specification as originally filed. See, for example, paras. 0116, 0134, and 0135 of the patent publication of the present application.

Claims 77, 78, 81, 82, 83, 86, 87, 90, 91 and 92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beckmann et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0035423). Claims 79, 80, 88 and 89 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckmann in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Claims 84, 85, 93 and 94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckmann in view of Terry (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0220119. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following arguments.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of Applicant's claim for foreign priority, that the certified copies of the priority documents have been received, and that the IDS papers have been signed and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Substance of Interview

As a preliminary matter, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by the Examiner and his supervisor in the September 16, 2009, in-person interview with Applicant's representatives, Jeffrey Lotspeich and In Jae Lim. The Examiners' comments and explanations were helpful and very much appreciated. Pursuant to MPEP § 713.04, Applicant provides the following remarks.

Prior to the interview, the Examiners were provided with proposed amendments to claim 77. Applicant's position with regard to this claim in view of the prior art was that as generally set forth below.

The Examiners acknowledged Applicant's position, and agreed that the proposed amendments to claim 77 (which is generally the same as that set forth above) appeared to define this

claim over the currently relied upon cited art. The Examiners further indicated that a more-detailed review of the amended claims, the cited references, as well as a further review and search of relevant prior art, would also be necessary before a patentability decision on the pending claims could be determined. The Examiners' time and attention to this application is gratefully acknowledged.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 77, 78, 81, 82, 83, 86, 87, 90, 91 and 92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beckmann.

Claim 77 recites "wherein the second identifier is an <u>MBMS</u> (Multimedia Broadcast/Multicast Service) identifier." The Office Action matches the MC-ID of Beckmann to teach this feature. This feature of Beckmann is illustrated in Fig 5, as set out below.

TCTF	MC-Id	MAC SDU

Fig. 5

According to Beckmann, the MC-ID field "contains the information by which the multicast <u>group can be identified</u>." (Beckman para. 0053, emphasis added). This so called "group identification" is quite different than the "MBMS identifier." This is further evident by the claimed feature that "the second identifier is used to distinguish between MBMS services." The claim relates to "services" not the identification of a "group."

In view of the foregoing, Beckmann fails to teach various features of independent claim 77, and thus, claim 77 is believed to be patentable. Independent claim 86 contains language similar to claim 77, and therefore is also believed to be patentable over this reference for reasons similar to those presented above in conjunction with claim 77. The rejected dependent claims are also patentable at least by virtue of their dependence upon their respective independent claims.

DSCH

Claims 84, 85, 93 and 94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckmann in view of Terry. Dependent claims 85 and 94 recite "wherein the shared transport channel is a <u>DSCH</u> (Downlink Shared Channel).

Page 2 of the Office Action refers to the logical channel DTCH projected onto a transport channel DSCH of Beckmann to teach this feature. (Beckman, para. 0010). This "projected onto" feature refers to only two of the four case scenarios of the Beckmann reference. Each of the four case scenarios of Beckmann are distinguishable from claim 1; such distinctions are set out in the following chart.

	Beckmann	Applicant's remarks
Case 1	Data packets are transmitted over the already existing transport channel FACH. [0045]	• No "projecting" is used and thus there is no "mapping."
Case 2a	Data packets are transmitted over the logical channel DTCH, projected onto FACH. [0046]	• Case 2a relates to "mapping" to a **FACH**, not the **DSCH** as required by claim 77. • DSCH "mapping" is considered in case 2b.
Case 2b	Data packets are transmitted over logical channel DTCH, projected onto DSCH. [0046]	"In the case where the **DTCH** is projected onto the **DSCH**, <u>the field "TCTF" is not present</u>, since only DTCH and DCCH are transmitted on this transport channel. . . " [0062]. • If TCTF is not present, then there is no "first identifier" as required by the claim.
Case 3	Data packets are transmitted over a previously non-existent transport channel MTCH. [0047]	• Similar to case 1, no "projecting" is used and thus there is no "mapping."

Page 7 of the Office Action relies upon para. 0038 of the Terry reference for such teachings. Applicant's review of Terry finds that the identified feature relates to mapping the CTCH onto the HS-DSCH. Although Terry discloses mapping onto the HS-DSCH, it does so with regard to the CTCH.

If one of ordinary skill were to modify Beckmann with the teachings of Terry, such teachings would apply to the cases in which Beckmann utilizes the CTCH. In Beckmann, the CTCH is only mentioned with regard to Cases 1 and 3. Thus, if the CTCH features of cases 1 and 3 of Beckmann were modified in accordance with Beckmann, claims 85 and 94 remain

distinguishable since Cases 1 and 3 of Beckmann do not involve "projecting" or "mapping" as set out in the above chart.

Teaching away by Beckmann

The Examiners also raised the point that it would be obvious to modify Beckmann so that data packets are transmitted over a logical channel projected onto the DSCH. It was briefly noted that para. 0010 of Beckmann supports such a position. However, Applicant's understanding of the Beckmann finds that such a feature is presently disclosed by Beckmann (as noted in case 2b of the above chart). Since Beckmann emphasizes that when such projecting is done onto the DSCH, the TCTF field is not to be present. Consequently, since TCTF is not present in such a scenario, then there is no "first identifier" as required by claims 85 and 04. This specific teaching (not using TCTF) represents an unmistakable teaching away of the use of TCTF, and thus, teaching away from the use of the "first identifier" of claim 77.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the currently pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Customer No. 035884

Date: September 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Waimey

/Jeffrey Lotspeich/

_____

Jeffrey J. Lotspeich
Registration No. 45,737
Attorney for Applicant